CONFORMED COPY ORIGINAL FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles Lucas Novak (SBN 257484) 1 LAW OFFICÈS OF LUCAS T. NOVAK 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069 FEB 25 2014 Telephone: (323) 337-9015 3 Email: lucas.nvk@gmail.com Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk 4 By Ingrid Flores, Deputy Attorney for Plaintiff, Elise Novak 5 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES** 9 10 Case No. BC522200 ELISE NOVAK, an individual, 11 CONSENT JUDGMENT Plaintiff, 12 PURSUANT TO TERMS OF **PROPOSITION 65 SETTLEMENT** 13 VS. 99¢ ONLY STORES, INC., a corporation, and Hon. John L. Segal Judge: 14 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, Dept.: September 24, 2013 Action Filed: 15 None Defendants. Trial Date: 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

CONSENT JUDGMENT

### 1. RECITALS

#### 1.1 The Parties

- 1.1.1 This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between Plaintiff, Elise

  Novak ("Plaintiff") and Defendant, 99¢ Only Stores (sued as 99 Cents Only Stores, Inc.)

  ("Defendant"). Plaintiff and Defendant shall hereinafter collectively be referred to as the "Parties."
- 1.1.2 Plaintiff is a citizen of the state of California with an interest in protecting the environment, improving human health and the health of ecosystems, and supporting environmentally sound practices, which includes promoting awareness of exposure to toxic chemicals and reducing exposure to hazardous substances found in consumer products.
- 1.1.3 Defendant employs ten (10) or more employees and is a person in the course of doing business as the term is defined in California *Health & Safety Code* section 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65").

# 1.2 Allegations

- 1.2.1 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant manufactured, distributed, supplied, and/or sold the "Torch" Flashlight (SKU 8-76416-09284-3) and similar flashlight products of various colors from Momentum Brands (hereinafter, the "Flashlight Products") in the State of California causing users in California to be exposed to hazardous levels of lead without providing "clear and reasonable warnings", in violation of Proposition 65. Lead is subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements because it is listed as known to cause cancer and birth defects and other reproductive harm.
- 1.2.2 On July 20, 2013, a sixty-day notice of violation ("60-Day Notice"), along with a Certificate of Merit, was provided by Plaintiff to Defendant and various public enforcement agencies regarding the alleged violation of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products.
- 1.2.3 On September 24, 2013, in the interest of the general public, Plaintiff filed the instant action in the Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles, alleging the sale of Flashlight Products without a warning violated Proposition 65.

#### 1.3 No Admissions

Defendant denies all allegations in Plaintiff's 60-Day Notice and Complaint, and maintains that the Products have been, and are, in compliance with all laws, and that Defendant has not violated Proposition 65. This Consent Judgment shall not be construed as an admission of liability by Defendant but to the contrary as a compromise of claims that are expressly contested and denied. However, nothing in this section shall affect the Parties' obligations, duties, and responsibilities under this Consent Judgment.

#### 1.4 No Waiver

Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any other or future legal proceeding, except as expressly provided in this Consent Judgment. By executing this Consent Judgment and agreeing to provide the relief and remedies specified herein, Defendant does not admit that this Action or any other action that may be filed against it in the future under Proposition 65 or any other cause of action is not preempted by Federal law. Defendant reserves all of its rights and defenses with regard to any claim by any person under Proposition 65 or otherwise, including the defense of federal preemption.

# 1.5 Compromise Agreement

This Consent Judgment is the product of negotiations during the litigation and is accepted by the Parties, for purposes of settling, compromising, and resolving issues disputed in this Action and shall not be used for any other purpose, or in any other matter.

#### 1.6 Jurisdiction and Venue

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that the above-entitled Court has jurisdiction over Defendant as to the allegations of the Complaint, that venue is proper in Los Angeles County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce this Consent Judgment pursuant to California *Code of Civil Procedure* section 664.6.

#### 1.7 Effective Date

The "Effective Date" shall be the date upon which this Consent Judgment is approved and entered by the Court.

# 

# 

# 2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND REFORMULATION

As of the Effective Date, Defendant shall not sell or offer for sale in California the Flashlight Products if they contain more than 100 parts per million ("ppm") of lead when analyzed pursuant to Environmental Protection Agency testing methodologies 3050B or equivalent.

# 3. PAYMENTS

# 3.1 Civil Penalty Pursuant To Proposition 65

- 3.1.1 In settlement of all causes of action in Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendant shall pay a civil penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) to be apportioned in accordance with *Health and Safety Code* section 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with 75% (\$3000) paid to State of California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, and the remaining 25% (\$1000) paid to Plaintiff.
- 3.1.2 Defendant shall issue two (2) checks for the civil penalty: (1) a check or money order made payable to "Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak in Trust for Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment" in the amount of \$3,000; and (2) a check or money order made payable to "Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak in Trust for Elise Novak" in the amount of \$1,000. Defendant shall remit the payments within ten (10) business days of the Effective Date, to:

Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak Attn: Lucas T. Novak 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069

# 3.2 Reimbursement Of Plaintiff's Fees And Costs

Defendant shall reimburse Plaintiff's reasonable experts' and attorney's fees and costs incurred in prosecuting the instant action, for all work performed through execution of this agreement and entry of this Consent Judgment. Accordingly, Defendant shall issue a check or money order made payable to "Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak" in the amount of twenty one thousand dollars (\$21,000.00). Defendant shall remit the payment within ten (10) business days of the Effective Date, to:

# 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069

Attn: Lucas T. Novak

Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak

# 4. ENFORCEMENT

#### 4.1 Enforcement Procedures

Prior to bringing any motion or order to show cause to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment, a Party seeking to enforce shall provide the violating party thirty (30) days advanced written notice of the alleged violation. The Parties shall meet and confer during such thirty (30) day period in an effort to try to reach agreement on an appropriate cure for the alleged violation. After such thirty (30) day period, the Party seeking to enforce may, by new action, motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court for Los Angeles County, seek to enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment.

# 5. RELEASES

#### 5.1 Plaintiff's Release Of Defendant

Plaintiff, acting in her individual capacity, her past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, and in the interest of the general public, in consideration of the promises and monetary payments contained herein, hereby releases Defendant, its parents, subsidiaries, shareholders, directors, members, officers, employees, attorneys, downstream distributors, retailers, franchisees, and purchasers and the vendors or manufacturers of the Flashlight Products to the extent those Flashlight Products were sold by Defendant (collectively "Released Parties"), from all claims for alleged violations of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law claims that could have been asserted in the public interest against the Released Parties with respect to the Flashlight Products.

#### 5.2 Defendant's Release Of Plaintiff

Defendant, by this Consent Judgment, waives all rights to institute any form of legal action against Plaintiff, her past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, experts, successors, and/or

assignees, for actions or statements made or undertaken, whether in the course of investigating claims or seeking enforcement of Proposition 65 against Defendant in this matter.

#### 5.3 Waiver of Unknown Claims

Each of the Parties acknowledges that it is familiar with Section 1542 of California *Civil Code* which provides as follows:

"A general release does not extend to claims which the creditor does not know or suspect to exist in his favor at the time of executing the release, which if known by him must have materially affected his settlement with the debtor."

Each of the parties waives and relinquishes any right or benefit it has or may have under Section 1542 of California *Civil Code* or any similar provision under the statutory or non-statutory law of any other jurisdiction to the full extent that it may lawfully waive all such rights and benefits pertaining to the claims in this Consent Judgment. The Parties acknowledge that each may subsequently discovery facts in addition to, or different from, those that it believes to be true with respect to the claims released herein. The Parties agree that this Consent Judgment and the releases contained herein shall be and remain effective in all respects notwithstanding the discovery of such additional or different facts.

#### 6. COURT APPROVAL

Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by all Parties, Plaintiff shall file a noticed Motion for Approval & Entry of Consent Judgment in the above-entitled Court. This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved and entered by the Court and shall be null and void if, for any reason, it is not approved and entered by the Court within one (1) year after its full execution by all Parties. It is the intention of the Parties that the Court approve this Consent Judgment, and in furtherance of obtaining such approval, the Parties and their respective counsel agree to mutually employ their best efforts to support the entry of this agreement in a timely manner, including cooperating on drafting and filing any papers in support of the required motion for judicial approval.

# 7. <u>SEVERABILITY</u>

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Subsequent to Court approval of this Consent Judgment, should any part or provision of this Consent Judgment, for any reason, be declared by a Court to be invalid, void or unenforceable, the remaining portions and provisions shall continue in full force and effect.

## 8. GOVERNING LAW

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

# 9. NOTICES

All correspondence and notices required to be provided under this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and delivered personally or sent by first class or certified mail addressed as follows:

# TO DEFENDANT:

Patrick J. Cafferty, Jr., Esq. Munger, Tolles & Olson, LLP 560 Mission Street, 27<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

#### TO PLAINTIFF:

Lucas T. Novak, Esq. Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069

#### 10. <u>INTEGRATION</u>

This Consent Judgment constitutes the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof and may not be amended or modified except in writing.

#### 11. **COUNTERPARTS**

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute the same document. Execution and delivery of this Consent Judgment by e-mail, facsimile, or other electronic means shall constitute legal and binding execution and delivery. Any photocopy of the executed Consent Judgment shall have the same force and effect as the originals.

#### 12. <u>AUTHORIZATION</u>

The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their respective Parties. Each Party has read, understood, and agrees to all of the terms and

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

1	conditions of this Consent Judgment. Each Party warrants to the other that it is free to enter
2	into this Consent Judgment and not subject to any conflicting obligation which will or might
3	prevent or interfere with the execution or performance of this Consent Judgment by said party.
4	*
5	AGREED TO:
6	Date: 12/13/13
7	By: Plaintiff, Elise Novak
8	1 mm/1, 2/150 110 tax
9	
10	AGREED TO:
11	Date:
12	By: Authorized Agent of Defendant, 99¢ Only Stores
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
- 11	

CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	conditions of this Consent Judgment. Each Party warrants to the other that it is free to enter
2	into this Consent Judgment and not subject to any conflicting obligation which will or might
3	prevent or interfere with the execution or performance of this Consent Judgment by said party.
4	
5	AGREED TO:
6	Date:
7	By: Plaintiff, Elise Novak
8	Taginora, Disc Ivoyan
9	
10	AGREED TO:
11	Date: 12-20-2013
12	By: Evelune Authorized Agent of Defendant, 99¢ Only Stores
13	Authorized Figure of Defendant, 779 Only Stores
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	į
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	CONSENT JUDGMENT

Plaintiff, Elise Novak and Defendant, 99¢ Only Stores have agreed through their respective counsel that judgment entered pursuant to the terms of their settlement agreement in Case No. BC522200, and following this Court's issuance of an Order approving this Proposition 65 settlement,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), and Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, judgment is hereby entered in accordance with the terms of the settlement described herein. By stipulation of the parties, the Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce the settlement under Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 2.25.14

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

JOSEPH R. KALIN